

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/903,838	07/11/2001	Richard E. Fangman	5686-00300	2194
7590 08/08/2005			EXAMINER	
Jeffrey C. Hood			LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG	
Conley, Rose, & Tayon, P.C. P.O. Box 398			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Austin, TX 78767			2664	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/903,838	FANGMAN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	-
	Andrew C. Lee	2664	
The MAILING DATE of this communical Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) date of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of this properties of the statutory minimum of the properties of the statute. Cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed  rty (30) days will be considered timely.  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>07/11/2001</u> .		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)			
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice	·	•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	)□ accepted or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority do  2. Certified copies of the priority do  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the Internationa  * See the attached detailed Office action from the certification from the action from the laternationa	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in a the priority documents have been I Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No  n received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	🗖	0 (DTO 440)	
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/12/2004.</li> </ol>	-948) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/903,838

Art Unit: 2664

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 45, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schuster et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6822957 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 31, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of a method, memory medium for configuring an IP telephone, comprising: receiving an identifier from the IP telephone (column 3, lines 20 - 32; column 8, lines 45 - 50; column 10, lines 23 - 32); determining if the identifier is valid (column 8, lines 52 - 55); and if the identifier is valid, assigning a range of port numbers to the IP telephone based on the identifier, wherein the IP telephone is operable to use at least a subset of the range of port numbers to send or receive IP communications (column 11, lines 1 – 12; column 16, lines 13 - 20).

Regarding claims 2, 17, 32, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of the method, system of claimed wherein said range of port numbers comprises ports which are not reserved for use by other IP protocols (Fig. 2, Fig. 3; column 11, lines 50 - 55; column 12, lines 31 - 43; column 16, lines 13 - 20).

Regarding claims 3, 15, 18, 30, 33, 45, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of the method of claimed further comprising: mediating IP communications between the IP telephone and an IP device, wherein the IP telephone uses at least a subset of the range of port numbers to send or receive said IP communications (column 13, lines 14 – 21; column 16, lines 13 – 20).

Regarding claims 4, 6, 19, 34, 21, 36, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of the method, system of claimed, wherein said mediating the IP communications comprises: receiving a data packet from the IP telephone, performing a network address persistent port translation (NAPPT) on the data packet (Fig. 9, column 15, lines 32 – 47); and sending the data packet to the IP device (column 16, lines 46 – 49).

Regarding claims 5, 20, 35, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of the method, system of claimed wherein the data packet comprises a private source IP address, a source port number, and destination information associated with the IP device, wherein the private source IP address comprises a private IP address of the IP telephone, and wherein the source port number comprises a port number in the assigned range of port numbers (column 3, lines 20 – 32; column 8, lines 45 – 50; column 10, lines 23 – 32; column 16, tines 13 – 20); and wherein said performing a network address persistent port translation (NAPPT) on the data packet comprises changing the private source IP address to a public source IP address while leaving the source port number unchanged, and wherein the public source IP address and the source port number may be used to uniquely identify the IP telephone (Fig. 9, column 15, lines 32 – 47; column 16, lines 13 – 20).

Regarding claims 7, 22, 37, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of the method, system of claimed wherein the data packet comprises a public destination IP address, a destination port number; and source information associated with the IP device, wherein the destination port number comprises a port number in the assigned range of port numbers, and wherein the public destination IP address and the destination port number may be used to uniquely identify the IP telephone (column 3, lines 20 - 32; column 8, lines 45 - 50; column 10, lines 23 - 32; column 16, lines 13 - 20); and wherein said performing a network address persistent port translation (NAPPT) on the data packet comprises using the public destination IP address and the destination port number to uniquely identify the IP telephone, and changing the public destination IP address to a private destination IP address while leaving the destination port number unchanged, wherein the private IP address comprises an IP address of the IP telephone (Fig. 9, column 15, lines 32 - 47; column 16, lines 13 - 20).

Regarding claim 16, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of a system for performing IP telephony, comprising: a network (Fig. 1, column 5, line 16 – 24); an IP telephone (Fig. 1, element 22, column 5, lines 24 – 26); a Service Gateway, wherein the Service Gateway is operable to couple to the IP telephone through the network (column 6, lines 23 – 25); wherein the IP telephone is operable to send an identifier to the Service Gateway; wherein the Service Gateway is operable to: receive an identifier from the IP telephone; determine if the identifier is valid; and if the identifier is valid, assign a range of port numbers to the IP telephone based on

Application/Control Number: 09/903,838

Art Unit: 2664

the identifier; wherein the IP telephone is operable to use at least a subset of the range of port numbers to send or receive IP communications (column 8, lines 52 – 55; column 11, lines 1 – 12, column 16, lines 13 – 20).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuster et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6822957 B1) in view of Fijolek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6577642 B1).

Regarding claims 8, 23, 38, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of a method, system for configuring an IP telephone, comprising: receiving an identifier from the IP telephone (column 3, lines 20 - 32; column 8, lines 45 - 50; column 10, lines 23 - 32). Schuster et al. does not disclose expressly the method, system of claimed wherein the identifier comprises a vendor class identifier. Fijolek et al. discloses the limitation of the method, system of claimed wherein the identifier comprises a vendor class identifier (column 10, lines 60 - 67; column 11, lines 5 - 9) column 11 - 12, Table 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schuster et al. to include of the

method, system of claimed wherein the identifier comprises a vendor class identifier such as that taught by Fijolek et al. in order to provide a variety of service offerings via and through a data-over-cable system (as suggested by Fijolek et al., see column 5, lines 4 - 5).

Regarding claims 9, 24, 39, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of a method, system for configuring an IP telephone, comprising: receiving an identifier from the IP telephone (column 3, lines 20 – 32; column 8, lines 45 – 50; column 10, lines 23 – 32). Schuster et al. does not disclose expressly the method of claimed wherein said determining comprises: determining if a MAC ID for the IP telephone is valid; and if the MAC ID is determined to be valid, then determining if the identifier is valid. Fijolek et al. discloses the method, system of claimed wherein said determining comprises: determining if a MAC ID for the data link layer is valid; and if the MAC ID is determined to be valid, then determining if the identifier is valid (column 8, lines 22 - 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schuster et al. to include of the method, system of claimed wherein said determining comprises: determining if a MAC ID for the data link layer is valid; and if the MAC ID is determined to be valid, then determining if the identifier is valid such as that taught by Fijolek et al. in order to provide a variety of service offerings via and through a data-over-cable system (as suggested by Fijolek et al., see column 5, lines 4 – 5).

Regarding claims 10, 25, 40, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of a method, system for configuring an IP telephone, comprising: receiving an identifier from the IP telephone (column 3, lines 20 – 32; column 8, lines 45 – 50; column 10,

Application/Control Number: 09/903,838

Art Unit: 2664

lines 23 – 32). Schuster et al. does not disclose expressly the method, system of claimed wherein said identifier is comprised in a DHCP discover message, the method further comprising: issuing a DHCP offer to the IP telephone if the identifier is determined to be valid, wherein the DHCP offer comprises DHCP lease information based on the validated identifier; the IP telephone issuing a DHCP request in response to the issued DHCP offer; storing the DHCP lease information in response to the issued DHCP request; the IP telephone storing the DHCP lease information; and the IP telephone enabling DHCP settings comprised in the DHCP lease information. Fijolek et al. discloses the limitation of the method, system of claimed wherein said identifier is comprised in a DHCP discover message, the method further comprising: issuing a DHCP offer to the IP telephone if the identifier is determined to be valid, wherein the DHCP offer comprises DHCP lease information based on the validated identifier (Fig. 13, elements 270, 278, 280, 282, 286; column 25, lines 40 - 63); the IP telephone issuing a DHCP request in response to the issued DHCP offer; storing the DHCP lease information in response to the issued DHCP request; the IP telephone storing the DHCP lease information; and the IP telephone enabling DHCP settings comprised in the DHCP lease information (Fig. 13, elements 300, 302, 308, 312, 318, 322, 320, 324; column 25, lines 40 – 63; column 26, lines 44 – 64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schuster et al. to include of the method, system of claimed wherein said identifier is comprised in a DHCP discover message, the method further comprising: issuing a DHCP offer to the IP telephone if the identifier is determined to be valid, wherein

the DHCP offer comprises DHCP lease information based on the validated identifier; the IP telephone issuing a DHCP request in response to the issued DHCP offer; storing the DHCP lease information in response to the issued DHCP request; the IP telephone storing the DHCP lease information; and the IP telephone enabling DHCP settings comprised in the DHCP lease information as that taught by Fijolek et al. in order to provide a variety of service offerings via and through a data-overcable system (as suggested by Fijolek et al., see column 5, lines 4 – 5).

Regarding claims 11, 12, 26, 27, 41, 42, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of the method, system of claimed, wherein the range of port numbers and information indicating operational software for the IP telephone (column 5, lines 55) -67; column 13, lines 14 - 21; column 16, lines 13 - 20), the method further comprising: the IP telephone executing the indicated operational software to enable said IP communications (column 13, lines 14 – 21; column 16, lines 13 – 20; column 6, lines 3 – 23). Schuster et al. does not disclose expressly the method, system of claimed wherein said DHCP lease information. Fijolek et al. discloses the limitation of the method, system of claimed wherein said DHCP lease information (column 24, lines 40 – 67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schuster et al. to include of the method, system of claimed wherein said DHCP lease information such as that taught by Fijolek et al. in order to provide a variety of service offerings via and through a data-over-cable system (as suggested by Fijolek et al., see column 5, lines 4-5).

Regarding claims 13, 28, 43, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of a method, system for configuring an IP telephone, comprising: receiving an identifier from the IP telephone (column 3, lines 20 – 32; column 8, lines 45 – 50; column 10, lines 23 – 32). Schuster et al. does not disclose expressly the method of claimed wherein said issuing the request for the operational software comprises issuing a read request to a file transfer server, wherein said file transfer server performs said providing the operational software to the IP telephone (column 9, lines 32 – 35; column 25, lines 65 – 67; column 26, lines 1 – 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schuster et al. to include the method of claimed wherein said issuing the request for the operational software comprises issuing a read request to a file transfer server, wherein said file transfer server performs said providing the operational software to the IP telephone such as that taught by Fijolek et al. in order to provide a variety of service offerings via and through a data-over-cable system (as suggested by Fijolek et al., see column 5, lines 4 - 5).

Regarding claims 14, 29, 44, Schuster et al. discloses the limitation of a method, system for configuring an IP telephone, comprising: receiving an identifier from the IP telephone (column 3, lines 20 - 32; column 8, lines 45 - 50; column 10, lines 23 - 32). Schuster et al. does not disclose expressly the method, system of claimed wherein the file transfer server comprises a TFTP (Trivial File Transfer Protocol) server (column 9, lines 32 - 35; column 25, lines 65 - 67; column 26, lines 1 - 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schuster et al. to include of the method,

system of claimed wherein the file transfer server comprises a TFTP (Trivial File Transfer Protocol) server such as that taught by Fijolek et al. in order to provide a variety of service offerings via and through a data-over-cable system (as suggested by Fijolek et al., see column 5, lines 4-5).

#### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (571) 272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 30, 2005

ACL

Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner

Page 10